

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**R. ALEXANDER ACOSTA,  
Plaintiff,**

**CIVIL ACTION**

**v.**

**CENTRAL LAUNDRY, INC., GEORGE  
RENGEPES AND JAMES RENGEPE,  
Defendants.**

**NO. 18-190**

**ORDER**

**AND NOW** this 26<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2019, upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 64), Defendants' Response in Opposition (ECF No. 65), and Plaintiff's Reply (ECF No. 66), **IT IS ORDERED** as follows.

Summary judgment is **GRANTED** to Plaintiff as follows:

1. Defendants James and George Rengepes were "covered employees" under the FLSA from July 1, 2017 to August 28, 2018, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d);
2. Defendant Central Laundry, Inc. was a "covered enterprise" under the FLSA from July 1, 2017 to March 20, 2018, *id.* at § 203(s)(1);
3. Defendants are liable for violations of the minimum wage provisions of the FLSA, *id.* at § 206(a);
4. Defendants are liable for violations of the overtime provisions of the FLSA, *id.* at § 207(a)(1);
5. Defendants are liable for violations of the recordkeeping provisions of the FLSA, *id.* at § 211(c);
6. Defendants James and George Rengepes are liable for \$133,335 in minimum wage and overtime back wages, and Defendant Central Laundry is liable for \$86,667.75 in minimum wage and overtime back wages, *id.* at § 216(c);
7. Defendants James and George Rengepes are liable for \$133,335 in liquidated damages, and Defendant Central Laundry is liable for \$86,667.75 in liquidated damages, *id.* at § 216(b);

8. Defendants are permanently enjoined from further violations of the minimum wage provisions, *id.* at § 206(a), overtime provisions, *id.* at § 207(a)(1), and recordkeeping provisions, *id.* at § 211(c), of the FLSA.

Summary judgment is **DENIED** as follows:

1. Whether Defendant Central Laundry was a “covered enterprise” from March 20, 2018 to August 28, 2018, *id.* at § 203(s)(1);
2. Whether Defendants violated the child labor provisions of the FLSA, *id.* at § 212(c);
3. Whether Defendants violated the anti-retaliation provisions of the FLSA, *id.* at § 215(a)(3); and
4. Whether Defendants are liable to former employee Adam Nickels for \$57,967.50 in front pay.

**July 29, 2019**

**BY THE COURT:**

**/s/Wendy Beetlestone, J.**

---

**WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.**